

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 06 2007

## REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending herein.

I. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the USPTO respectfully alleges on page 2 of the Office Action that the limitation of claim 1 claiming "a judging section not to be the medical image read by the medical image reading apparatus" is "unclear and there is no sufficient back up in the specification that includes this limitation.

Applicants respectfully note that claim 1 has been amended for § 112 purposes to read in relevant part:

"a judging section to judge whether the medical image recorded in the phosphor plate contained in the cassette is read by the medical image reading apparatus."

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found on page 26, line 26 through page 28, line 5 of the present specification. Specifically, page 27, lines 17-19 of the present specification explains that "the CPU 41 refers to the correspondence table 462 and judges whether or not medical images are read out from all cassettes 70 respectively" (emphasis added). Thus, CPU 41 is one possible example of the claimed judging section of claim 1. Further support for the claimed judging section can be found in present Figure 7 and on page 34, line 1 through page 39, line 4 of the present specification.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the specification clearly supports the claimed judging section of claim 1, and therefore the § 112 rejection has been overcome.

II. The obviousness rejections based on Kanada et al. (6,954,767) in view of Vastenaeken (US 6,379,044).

On page 3 of the Office Action, the USPTO respectfully rejects "claims 1-18" under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanada et al. in view of Vastenaeken et al. However, Applicants respectfully note that only claims 1-12 are pending in the present application, and the detailed description of the obviousness rejection in item 5 (i.e., on pages 3-11 of the Office Action) only relates to claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-12.

KOY-0018  
Serial No. 10/694,653

Thus, it is respectfully believed that the USPTO intended to reject claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-12 based on Kanada in view of Vastenaeken. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

A. The cited references do not teach or suggest a portable radiographing information apparatus displaying previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1.

Claim 1 claims in relevant part:

**"a portable radiographing information apparatus displaying previously stored radiographing order information at the visited patient's location, the apparatus having a correspondence setting section to set correspondence of the identification information of the cassette to the radiographing order information for radiographing using the cassette."** (emphasis added)

No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amendments is found on page 17, lines 8-19 and page 21, line 18 through page 22, line 4 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

Specifically, the USPTO respectfully alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that Figure 1 of Kanada teaches a portable radiographing information apparatus at elements 12, 13, and also elements 112, 113, and 116 of Figure 11 of Kanada. However, it is respectfully important to note that these structures of Kanada are not the specifically claimed portable radiographing information apparatus claimed in claim 1.

For example, elements 12 and 13 in Figure 1 of Kanada are image recording modalities, and not portable radiographing information apparatuses, as claimed in claim 1. In other words, elements 12 and 13 of Kanada are devices such as CT or MRI machines that actually record the images from the patients (see column 14, lines 4-6 of Kanada). Thus, in comparison to present Figure 1, image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada correspond to portable radiographing apparatus 60 of present Figure 1, and not portable radiographing information apparatus 10. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada are completely different devices than a portable radiographing information apparatus, as claimed in claim 1.

Additionally, there is no indication at all in Kanada that image recording modalities 12 and 13 display previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1. Instead, it appears that image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada only record image

data from a patient. Thus, image recording modalities 12 and 13 are not a portable radiographing information apparatus that displays previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1.

Similarly, elements 112 and 113 in Figure 11 of Kanada are also image recording modalities (see column 24, lines 29-30 of Kanada). Thus, elements 112 and 113 of Kanada also cannot be the specifically claimed portable radiographing information apparatus of claim 1.

Regarding element 116 of Kanada, it is respectfully important to note that Kanada explicitly states at column 24, lines 65-66 that "reference terminal 116 is a terminal **only** for referring to image data" (**emphasis added**). As explained at column 24, lines 48-49 of Kanada, the "image data" is the data recorded by the image recording modality. In other words, the "image data" on reference terminal 116 of Kanada is the actual image recorded by the imaging modality. Thus, because reference terminal 116 **only** refers to "image data," it respectfully follows logically that reference terminal 116 does not display previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no indication at all in Kanada that reference terminal 116 is a **portable** device, as claimed in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully clear that reference terminal 116 is not a portable radiographing information apparatus displaying previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, none of the alleged elements 12, 13, 112, 113, or 116 of Kanada are a portable radiographing information apparatus that displays previously stored radiographing order information. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that Kanada does not teach or suggest the specifically claimed portable radiographing information apparatus of claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully assert that Vastenaeken does not overcome these deficiencies in Kanada. Vastenaeken is directed to a method of varying radiation based on characteristics of a recording medium (see abstract), and Vastenaeken does not teach or suggest anything about a portable radiographing information apparatus that displays previously recorded radiographing order information.

In contrast, present Figures 1 and 2 illustrate one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. Specifically, as seen in Figure 1, a portable radiographing information apparatus 10 can be a portable device such as a personal digital assistant (PDA). As explained on page 17 of the present specification, PDA 10 can display specified radiographing order

**information.** As further explained on page 17 of the present specification, other exemplary embodiments of the portable radiographing information apparatus may include, but are not limited to, notebook computers or portable telephone terminals, in addition to the portable PDA. Thus, PDA 10 is one possible example of a portable radiographing information apparatus that displays previously stored radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 1.

The claimed structure quoted above is important and non-trivial because it provides **inherent** advantages over conventional devices. For example, as noted on pages 2-6 of the present specification, it can be advantageous to use a portable radiographing system at the patient's location when the patient is seriously injured or in a post-operation condition. In these situations, the portable radiographing information apparatus claimed in claim 1 is advantageous because **it allows a medical professional to keep track of multiple radiographing orders without excessive paperwork** (see page 5 of the present specification). Furthermore, the portable radiographing information apparatus can **reduce the occurrence of erroneous duplicate recordings on a cassette** (see page 6, lines 11-18 of the present specification).

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claimed limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references.

**B. The cited references do not teach or suggest the specifically claimed portable radiographing information apparatus as claimed in claim 9.**

Claim 9 claims in relevant part:

"the portable radiographing information apparatus comprising:

**a radiographing order information receiving section** to receive one or more pieces of radiographing order information;

**a storing section** to store the one or more pieces of radiographing order information received by the radiographing order information receiving section;

**an input section** to input the identification information of the cassette used for radiographing in;

**a correspondence setting section** to set correspondence of the identification information of the cassette inputted by the input section to one piece of radiographing order information which is selected from the one or more pieces of radiographing order information stored by the storing section and which relates to the radiographing using the cassette; and

a radiographing order transmitting section to transmit the identification information of the cassette and the radiographing order information of which the correspondence to each other is set by the correspondence setting section.” (emphasis added)

Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

First, the USPTO respectfully alleges on page 9, lines 10-11 of the Office Action that image recording modalities 12 or 13 of Kanada are a portable radiographing information apparatus. However, as noted above, image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada are the image recording devices such as CT or MRI machines that actually record the image, and not a portable radiographing information apparatus (see column 14, lines 4-6 of Kanada).

Second, the USPTO further respectfully alleges that the various elements of the portable radiographing information apparatus are taught by:

- image server 14 of Kanada (page 9, line 18 of the Office Action)
- hard disc 14a of Kanada (page 9, line 19 of the Office Action)
- electronic processing unit 9 of Vastenaeken (page 10, line 2 of the Office Action)
- workstation 15 or reference terminal 16 of Kanada (page 10, line 10 of the Office Action).

However, it is respectfully important to note that the cited references do not teach or suggest that these structures can be combined as elements of a portable radiographing information apparatus, as claimed in claim 9.

Instead, image server 14 of Kanada is a computer for interfacing with the image archiving apparatus 17 or 18 (see column 14, lines 21-23 of Kanada). Similarly, workstation 15 and reference terminal 16 of Kanada are separate computer terminals (see column 14, lines 31-43 of Kanada). Also, electronic signal processing unit 9 of Vastenaeken is a device connected to an x-ray generator (see column 5, lines 65-67 of Vastenaeken). Thus, it is respectfully clear that each of these structures are separate and distinct devices, and neither Kanada nor Vastenaeken teaches or suggests that these structures can be combined into a single portable radiographing information apparatus.

Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that the cited references teach the functions of each element of the portable radiographing information apparatus of claim 9, it is respectfully asserted

that the cited references still do not teach the specifically claimed portable radiographing information apparatus of claim 9 because there is no teaching or suggestion that each of these elements can be combined into a single portable device.

In contrast, present Figure 2 illustrates one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. As seen in present Figure 2, a portable radiographing information apparatus 10 may have a CPU 11, an order registration file 161, a barcode reader 17, and a communication control section 14.

As noted on pages 19-20 of the present specification, CPU 11 can act as a correspondence setting section to set correspondence of the identification information, as claimed in claim 9. Page 21 of the present specification explains how barcode reader 17 can read out the cassette ID of a cassette; thus, barcode reader 17 is an example of the specifically claimed input section of claim 9. As noted on page 22 of the present specification, communication control section 14 can serve as both a radiographing order information receiving section and a radiographing order transmitting section, as claimed in claim 9. Furthermore, page 23 of the present specification explains that order registration file 161 is one possible example of a storing section that stores radiographing order information, as claimed in claim 9.

Overall, it is respectfully important to note that each of these elements of claim 9 are found in a single portable radiographing information apparatus 10 (such as a PDA), as shown in present Figures 1 and 2. In contrast, the cited references only allegedly teach each of the elements in separate, distinct devices, and not in a single portable device, as claimed in claim 9.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claimed limitations of claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that claim 9 is not allowable over the cited references.

#### C. Further explanation.

Applicants respectfully note the following further explanation regarding claims 1 and 9. The devices of claims 1 and 9 relate to a medical image radiographing system in which a radiographer circulates and radiographs patients by using a portable radiographing apparatus and

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 06 2007

a portable radiographing information apparatus (see page 17, line 20 through page 18, line 3 of the present specification).

On the other hand, Kanada relates to an image archive device for diagnosing a radiographed image. The intended use of the radiographing system of claims 1 and 9 is different from that of Kanada. When patients are radiographed, Kanada's portable terminal is not carried to a visited patient's location. Therefore, even though Vastenaeken is combined with Kanada, claims 1 and 9 are not obvious over the combination of these references.

D. The dependent claims.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable, and therefore, it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, and 11-12 are also allowable.

III. The obviousness rejections based on Kanada et al. (6,954,767) in view of Fukushima (US 5,051,849).

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kanada et al. in view of Fukushima et al. As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 6 and 10 are allowable.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 06 2007

IV. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
/Daniel P. Lent/

Daniel P. Lent  
Registration No. 44,867

\*the above is an "s signature"  
37 CFR 1.4(d)(2)

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: July 6, 2007